

**Salmon Habitat Limiting Factors in Washington State**  
**By**  
**Carol J. Smith, Ph.D.**  
**Washington State Conservation Commission**  
**Olympia, Washington**



## **Acknowledgements**

This statewide document is a summary of all individual Habitat Limiting Factors reports developed for 45 basins in Washington State from 1998 through 2003, and could not have been written without the efforts of the many people who developed these original documents. The primary authors of these reports include Donald Haring, John Kerwin, Carmen Andonaegui, Mike Kuttel Jr., Gary Wade, Ginna Correa, Mary Wilkosz, Brian Cowan, Kevin Lautz, and Carol Smith with leadership from Ed Manary and additional support from Randy McIntosh (NWIFC), Kurt Fresh (NOAA Fisheries), Jennifer Cutler (NWIFC), Devin Smith (SRSC), and Ron McFarlane (NWIFC). This statewide report closely follows the outline used in the basin reports including some of the same text in introductory sections that was developed by the above-mentioned individuals, and this project would not have been possible without their vast expertise. All of the individual reports are listed in the Literature Cited section even though some are not directly cited because data within each of these reports was used in the accompanying Excel habitat ratings spreadsheet, which formed the basis for further analyses.

I would also like to thank other authors of limiting factors reports such as Pierce Conservation District (WRIA 12 report) and the Foster Creek Conservation District (WRIA 50 report) as well as the following reviewers: David Hoopes, Brad Johnson, Katie Krueger, Kim Bredensteiner, and Don Haring.

In addition, I gratefully thank Ron McFarlane of the NWIFC for creating the habitat rating maps, and the Salmon Recovery Funding Board for funding this project.

Cover pictures feature the upper Skagit River (top photo) and Ruby Beach (bottom photo).

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

Table of Contents.....	3
List of Figures.....	7
List of Tables .....	7
Executive summary.....	15
Fish Stocks and Status Conclusions .....	15
General Salmon Habitat Conditions in Washington State.....	15
Conclusions.....	17
Habitat Limiting Factors Background and Introduction.....	18
How to Use This Document.....	18
Habitat Limiting Factors Background .....	18
New Products in this Report .....	19
Anadromous Salmonid Stocks and their Status in Washington State .....	20
Anadromous Salmonid Species in Washington State.....	20
Comparison of Stocks Between Drainages.....	22
Number of Total, Wild, and Native Salmon and Steelhead Stocks by Drainage .....	24
Chinook Salmon Abundance by Basin .....	40
Stocks and Abundance by Region .....	43
North Puget Sound.....	47
Ecoregions and Land Use In Washington State.....	62
Introduction.....	62
Statewide Statistics .....	63
The Olympic Mountains Region.....	65
Puget Lowlands Region .....	73
The Columbia Basin .....	84

Blue Mountains Region .....	88
Statewide Habitat Limiting Factors Introduction .....	91
Introduction to Habitat Impacts .....	91
Individual Limiting Factors Analysis Background and Methodology .....	91
WRIA-Scale Data Summarization Methodology .....	92
Statewide Habitat Limiting Factors Results .....	94
WRIAs Sorted by Habitat Ratings.....	100
WRIAs Sorted by Salmonid Stock Results.....	101
Salmon Habitat Ratings by Recovery Region .....	103
Statewide Salmonid Access Conditions .....	111
Land Ownership.....	112
Land Use .....	114
Data Gaps in Salmonid Access Conditions .....	117
Statewide Salmonid Floodplain Conditions .....	118
Introduction.....	118
Floodplain Conditions and Land Ownership .....	122
Floodplain Conditions and Land Use .....	123
Data Gaps for Statewide Floodplain Conditions .....	126
Statewide Salmonid Riparian Conditions .....	127
Introduction.....	127
Riparian Conditions and Land Ownership.....	130
Riparian Conditions and Land Use.....	131
Data Gaps in Riparian Conditions .....	134
Statewide Salmonid Sediment Conditions.....	135
Introduction.....	135

Sediment Quantity .....	135
Sediment Quality .....	135
Stability .....	136
Road Density.....	136
Sedimentation Results Overview.....	137
Sediment Conditions and Land Ownership .....	143
Sediment Conditions and Land Use.....	144
Data Gaps for Sediment Conditions in Washington State.....	147
Statewide Large Woody Debris Conditions .....	148
Introduction.....	148
Large Woody Debris Conditions and Land Ownership.....	151
Sediment Conditions and Land Use.....	152
Data Gaps in Statewide LWD Conditions .....	154
Statewide Salmonid Pool habitat Conditions .....	156
Introduction.....	156
Pool Habitat and Land Ownership.....	158
Salmonid Pool Habitat and Land Use.....	159
Data Gaps in Salmonid Pool Habitat Data.....	161
Statewide Salmonid water temperature Conditions.....	163
Introduction.....	163
Water Temperature and Land Ownership.....	169
Water Temperature and Land Use .....	170
Data Gaps in Water Temperature .....	173
Statewide Salmonid High flow Conditions .....	174
Introduction.....	174

High Flows and Land Ownership .....	178
High Flow Conditions and Land Use .....	179
Data Gaps in High Flow Conditions.....	181
Statewide Salmonid Low Flow Conditions .....	183
Introduction.....	183
Low Flow Conditions and Land Ownership.....	186
Low Flow Conditions and Land Use .....	187
Data Gaps and Low Flow Conditions.....	189
Estuarine and Nearshore Habitat .....	190
Estuary Habitat and Function .....	190
Nearshore Habitat and Function .....	190
Types of Estuarine and Nearshore Habitat Impacts.....	191
Estuarine and Nearshore Habitat Conditions in Washington State .....	193
Conclusions and Discussion .....	196
Fish Stocks and Status Conclusions .....	196
Overall Freshwater Habitat Conclusions .....	196
Discussion.....	198
Salmonid Habitat Rating Standards For Identifying Limiting Factors.....	200
Literature Cited.....	208

## LIST OF FIGURES

Figure 1. Number of salmonid stocks on the Endangered Species List in Washington State. Color intensity relates to the number of listed stocks. The more intense the color, the greater number of listed stocks. ....	21
Figure 2. Total number of Washington salmon and steelhead stocks by drainage (raw data from WDFW 2002). Increased color intensity indicates a greater number of stocks in that basin. ....	37
Figure 3. Total number of wild (naturally spawning) Washington salmon and steelhead stocks by drainage (raw data from WDFW 2002). Increased color intensity indicates a greater number of stocks in that basin. ....	38
Figure 4. Total number of native-origin Washington salmon and steelhead stocks by drainage (raw data from WDFW 2002). Increased color intensity indicates a greater number of stocks in that basin. ....	39
Figure 5. Stock health by region based upon total number of stocks listed in WDFW 2002. “Not healthy” includes depressed, critical, and recently extinct. The “not healthy” category is under-represented in the Columbia Basin because extinct stocks in that region were not listed in the SaSI report although they were included for other regions when known. ....	59
Figure 6. Stock health by region based upon the number of wild or naturally-spawning stocks listed in WDFW 2002. “Not healthy” includes depressed, critical, and recently extinct. The “not healthy” category is under-represented in the Columbia Basin because extinct stocks in that region were not listed in the SaSI report although they were included for other regions when known. ....	60
Figure 7. Stock health by region based upon total number of native-origin stocks listed in WDFW 2002. “Not healthy” includes depressed, critical, and recently extinct. The “not healthy” category is under-represented in the Columbia Basin because extinct stocks in that region were not listed in the SaSI report although they were included for other regions when known. ....	61
Figure 8. Ecoregions within Washington State. Base map from U.S.G.S. (2003) and classification based upon the work of Lasmanis (1991). ....	63
Figure 9. Land cover by percentage of area in Washington State (data from Cassidy et al. 1997). ....	64
Figure 10. Conservation Status of lands in Washington State (map from Cassidy et al. 1997). The greatest protection is found in Status 1 and decreasing levels of protection in subsequent status levels with Status 4 having little to no protection for habitat conservation. ....	65

Figure 11. Average annual precipitation within the State of Washington (Oregon State University 2000, used with permission). .....	66
Figure 12. Land use in the Olympic Mountains Region (data from Hashim 2002). .....	67
Figure 13. Land ownership by percentage of land area within the Olympic Mountains Region (data from Lunetta et al. 1997).....	68
Figure 14. Human population density for the Olympic Mountain and Willapa Hills Regions compared to the state average (data from U.S. Census Bureau 2000). .....	69
Figure 15. Annual stream flow per area by watershed ( $m^2$ per second per $km^2$ ). Data from Weitkamp et al. 1995 and Meyers et al. 1998. ....	70
Figure 16. Land use in the Willapa Hills Region by WRIA (data from Hashim 2002). ....	71
Figure 17. Land ownership by acres in the Willapa Hills Region (data from Hashim 2002). .....	72
Figure 18. Human population densities in the Puget Lowland Region compared to the state average (data from the U.S. Census Bureau 2000).....	74
Figure 19. Land use and vegetation cover in Washington State (USGS 2003).....	75
Figure 20. Land use in the Puget Lowland Region (data from Hashim 2002). .....	76
Figure 21. Land ownership in the Puget Lowland Region by WRIA (data from Hashim 2002).....	77
Figure 22. Land ownership by WRIA in the Cascade Mountains Region (data from Hashim 2002).....	79
Figure 23. Human population densities in Clark County (Portland Basin Region) and the counties that comprise much of the Cascade Mountain Region (data from U.S. Census Bureau 2000). ....	80
Figure 24. Land use in the Cascade Mountain basins (data from Hashim 2002). .....	81
Figure 25. Land use in the Okanogan Highlands Region (data from Hashim 2002). .....	82
Figure 26. Human population densities in the counties that comprise the Okanogan Highlands Region (data from Hashim 2002).....	83
Figure 27. Land ownership in the WRIs of the Okanogan Highlands Region (data from Hashim 2002).....	84
Figure 28. Land use in the Columbia Basin (data from Hashim 2002). .....	86
Figure 29. Land ownership in the Columbia Basin (data from Hashim 2002).....	86



Figure 30. Human population densities in the counties comprising much of the Columbia Basin. Yakima County data are in Figure 21 (data from the U.S. Census Bureau 2000).	87
Figure 31. Human population densities in the Blue Mountains Region (Asotin, Garfield, and Columbia Counties) and part of the Columbia Basin Region (Lincoln and Adams Counties) compared to the state average (data from the U.S. Census Bureau 2000).	89
Figure 32. Land use in the Blue Mountains and Palouse Regions (data from Hashim 2002).	90
Figure 33. Land ownership in the Palouse and Blue Mountains Regions (data from Hashim 2002).	90
Figure 34. Summary of habitat conditions in WRIAs 1-7 (WRIAs 1=Nooksack, 2=San Juan, 3-4=Skagit, 5=Stillaguamish, 6=Island, and 7=Snohomish).	94
Figure 35. Summary of habitat conditions in WRIAs 8-15 (WRIAs 8=Lake Washington, 9=Green, 10=Puyallup, 11=Nisqually, 12=Chambers, 13=Deschutes, 14=Kennedy, 15=Kitsap).	96
Figure 36. Summary of habitat conditions from WRIA 16-21 (WRIAs 16=West Hood Canal, 17=Quilcene, 18=Dungeness/Elwha, 19=Hoko, 20=North Coast, and 21=Queets/Quinault).	97
Figure 37. Summary of habitat conditions in WRIAs 22-29 (WRIAs 22-23=Chehalis, 24=Willapa, 25=Grays, 26=Cowlitz, 27=Lewis, 28=Salmon/Washougal, and 29=Wind/White Salmon).	98
Figure 38. Summary of habitat conditions in WRIAs 30-40 (WRIAs 30=Klickitat, 31=Rock, 32=Walla Walla, 34=Palouse, 35=Middle Snake, 37=Lower Yakima, 38=Naches, and 39=Upper Yakima).	99
Figure 39. Summary of habitat conditions in WRIAs 44-62 (WRIAs 44=Moses Coulee, 45=Wenatchee, 46=Entiat, 48=Methow, 49=Okanogan, 50=Foster, and 62=Pend Oreille).	100
Figure 40. Overall WRIA-wide ratings based upon the total score of habitat conditions in Table 5.	101
Figure 41. Habitat ratings by WRIA for the drainages with the greatest number of salmon and steelhead stocks. For a list of WRIA names with number, see the legend in Figure 40.	102
Figure 42. Habitat ratings by WRIA for drainages with the greatest abundance of chinook salmon. For a list of WRIA names with number, see the legend in Figure 40.	103
Figure 43. Summary of habitat conditions by salmon recovery region.	104

Figure 44. Salmonid access ratings by WRIA.....	111
Figure 45. Map of salmonid access ratings by WRIA throughout the State. ....	112
Figure 46. Salmonid access conditions based upon federal land ownership.....	113
Figure 47. Salmonid access conditions based upon state land ownership.....	113
Figure 48. Salmonid access conditions based upon private land ownership.....	114
Figure 49. Salmonid access conditions based upon forestry land use.....	115
Figure 50. Salmonid access conditions based upon agricultural land use.....	115
Figure 51. Salmonid access conditions based upon urban land use. ....	116
Figure 52. Salmonid access conditions based upon population density. ....	116
Figure 53. Floodplain ratings by WRIA across Washington State.....	120
Figure 54. Floodplain conditions in Type 1 streams by WRIA.....	120
Figure 55. Map of floodplain ratings by WRIA in Washington State. Floodplain conditions were not applicable in WRIA 2.....	121
Figure 56. Floodplain conditions based upon percent federal land. ....	122
Figure 57. Floodplain conditions based upon the percent of state owned land. ....	123
Figure 58. Floodplain conditions based upon percent of private land.....	123
Figure 59. Floodplain conditions based upon percent of forestland.....	124
Figure 60. Floodplain conditions based upon percent agricultural land.....	124
Figure 61. Floodplain conditions based upon percent urban land. ....	125
Figure 62. Floodplain conditions based upon human population density. ....	125
Figure 63. Statewide riparian conditions by WRIA. ....	128
Figure 64. Map of riparian conditions by WRIA throughout Washington State.....	129
Figure 65. Riparian conditions based upon percent federal land.....	130
Figure 66. Riparian conditions based upon percent state owned land.....	130
Figure 67. Riparian conditions based upon percent private land.....	131
Figure 68. Riparian conditions based upon percent forestland.....	132

Figure 69. Riparian conditions based upon percent urban land.....	132
Figure 70. Riparian conditions based upon human population density.....	133
Figure 71. Riparian conditions based upon percent agricultural land. ....	133
Figure 72. Sediment conditions by WRIA throughout Washington State.....	138
Figure 73. Map of sediment quantity conditions by WRIA in Washington State.....	139
Figure 74. Map of sediment quality conditions by WRIA in Washington State.....	140
Figure 75. Road density ratings for WRIAs in Washington State.....	141
Figure 76. Streambed, channel, and bank stability ratings by WRIA in Washington State. .....	142
Figure 77. Sediment conditions based upon federal land ownership. ....	143
Figure 78. Sediment conditions based upon private land ownership. ....	144
Figure 79. Sediment conditions based upon state-owned land.....	144
Figure 80. Sediment conditions based upon percent forestland. ....	145
Figure 81. Sediment conditions based upon percent of agricultural lands. ....	146
Figure 82. Sediment conditions based upon percent urban land. ....	146
Figure 83. Sediment conditions based upon population density. ....	147
Figure 84. Large woody debris conditions by WRIA throughout Washington State.....	149
Figure 85. Map of large woody debris conditions in Washington State.....	150
Figure 86. Large woody debris conditions based upon percent federal land. ....	151
Figure 87. Large woody debris conditions based upon percent state owned land.....	152
Figure 88. Large woody debris conditions based upon percent private land. ....	152
Figure 89. Large woody debris conditions based upon percent forestland. ....	153
Figure 90. Large woody debris conditions based upon percent agricultural land. ....	153
Figure 91. Large woody debris conditions based upon percent urban land. ....	154
Figure 92. Large woody debris conditions based upon population density.....	154
Figure 93. Salmonid Pool Habitat Ratings by WRIA in Washington State. ....	156

Figure 94. Map of WRIA-wide ratings for salmonid pool habitat in Washington. ....	157
Figure 95. Salmonid Pool Habitat based upon federal land ownership.....	158
Figure 96. Salmonid pool habitat based upon state land ownership.....	159
Figure 97. Salmonid pool habitat ratings by WRIA based upon private land ownership.	159
Figure 98. Salmonid pool habitat by WRIA based upon forestland.....	160
Figure 99. Salmonid pool habitat by WRIA based upon percent agricultural land.....	160
Figure 100. Salmonid pool habitat by WRIA based upon percent urban land. ....	161
Figure 101. Salmonid pool habitat based upon people per acre. ....	161
Figure 102. Water temperature ratings by WRIA in Washington State. ....	165
Figure 103. Statewide water temperature ratings by WRIA.....	166
Figure 104. Statewide dissolved oxygen ratings by WRIA in Washington State. ....	167
Figure 105. Statewide miscellaneous water quality problems (toxins, nutrients, pH) by WRIA in Washington State. ....	168
Figure 106. Water temperature ratings by WRIA based upon federal land ownership....	169
Figure 107. Water temperature ratings by WRIA based upon state owned land ownership. .....	169
Figure 108. Water temperature ratings by WRIA based upon private land ownership....	170
Figure 109. Water temperature ratings by WRIA based upon percent federal land ownership.....	171
Figure 110. Water temperature ratings by WRIA based upon percent agricultural land use. .....	171
Figure 111. Water temperature ratings by WRIA based upon percent urban land use. ...	172
Figure 112. Water temperature ratings by WRIA based upon people per acre. ....	172
Figure 113. High flow ratings by WRIA in Washington State.....	175
Figure 114. Map of high flow ratings by WRIA in Washington State based upon hydrologic maturity.....	176
Figure 115. Map of impervious surfaces ratings by WRIA in Washington State. ....	177

Figure 116. High flow conditions based upon the percent federal land. ....	178
Figure 117. High flow conditions based upon the percent of state owned land. ....	178
Figure 118. High flow conditions based upon percent of private owned lands.....	179
Figure 119. High flow ratings by WRIA based on percent forestland. ....	180
Figure 120. High flow ratings by WRIA based on percent agricultural land. ....	180
Figure 121. High flow ratings by WRIA based upon percent urban land. ....	181
Figure 122. High flow ratings by WRIA based on people per acre.....	181
Figure 123. Low flow ratings by WRIA in Washington State. ....	184
Figure 124. Map of low flow conditions by WRIA in Washington State. ....	185
Figure 125. Low flow conditions based upon percent federal lands. ....	186
Figure 126. Low flow conditions by WRIA based upon percent state ownership. ....	186
Figure 127. Low flow conditions based upon percent of private land ownership.....	187
Figure 128. Low flow conditions by WRIA based upon percent forestland. ....	187
Figure 129. Low flow conditions by WRIA based upon percent agricultural land.....	188
Figure 130. Low flow conditions by WRIA based upon percent urban land. ....	188
Figure 131. Low flow conditions by WRIA based upon people per acre. ....	189

## LIST OF TABLES

Table 1. Number of total, wild, and native salmon and steelhead stocks by drainage with the percentage of healthy stocks (green), unknown status stocks (blue), and depressed, critical, or extinct stocks (red) shown in bars (raw data from WDFW 2002). .....	26
Table 2. Recent average natural (wild) chinook escapement levels. See text for data sources. ....	42
Table 3. Number of total, wild, and native salmon and steelhead stocks by drainage sorted by region with the percentage of healthy stocks (green), unknown status stocks (blue), and depressed, critical, or extinct stocks (red) shown in bars (data from WDFW 2002). ....	47
Table 4. Statewide habitat limiting factors results by WRIA. ....	105
Table 5. WRIAs sorted by overall habitat ratings in descending order. See detailed spreadsheets in a separate file for ratings details. Numerical ratings of 3=Good, 2=Fair, 1=Poor. ....	108
Table 6. General WRIA-wide estuarine concerns as listed in LFA reports. ....	194
Table 7. Percent of WRIA-wide habitat ratings by habitat categories. ....	197
Table 8. Ratings Standards Used in the Limiting Factors Analysis Reports.....	203

## **EXECUTIVE SUMMARY**

From 1998 through 2003, salmon habitat limiting factors analysis (LFA) reports were developed for all basins in Washington State that produced salmon or steelhead in addition to one Watershed Resource Inventory Area (WRIA) that produced only bull trout as an anadromous species. This is a summary report of those 45 individual reports that provides an overview of the results on a state, regional, and WRIA scale. Habitat results are also related to land ownership and land use. The purposes of this report are to provide a broader perspective of salmon habitat conditions and provide information across the state by habitat category, which is useful for those who are more interested in a particular type of habitat parameter rather than a specific stream. It shows how different habitat conditions vary by category across the state, and how land use and land ownership may play a role in habitat conditions. This report provides the following products: 1) a spreadsheet that provides at a glance all habitat ratings for the streams in all LFA reports, 2) maps and discussion of WRIA-scale ratings developed from the most frequent habitat ratings by category, 3) A discussion of the extent of data gaps for salmon habitat throughout Washington State, 4) the relationship of WRIA-wide habitat ratings results to land use and land ownership, and 5) a summary of salmonid stocks and stock status by basin.

### **Fish Stocks and Status Conclusions**

Salmonid production, stocks, and status vary greatly across Washington State. Out of 161 independent salmon-producing drainages, three (Chehalis, Quillayute, and Skagit) produce 14% of the total, 17% of the wild, and 19% of the native salmon and steelhead stocks in the state. Twelve out of 161 drainages produce 35% of the total, 45% of the wild, and 38% of the native salmon and steelhead stocks in the state. These twelve drainages are the Chehalis, Quillayute, Skagit, Snohomish, Cowlitz, Nooksack, Queets, Stillaguamish, Puyallup, Quinault, Lewis, and Dungeness basins, which combined produce much of the genetic diversity of salmon and steelhead populations in the state.

The percent of healthy stocks also differs widely (stocks of unknown status are not included in the percentage). The Snake River, upper Columbia, and lower Columbia regions have very low percentages of healthy wild salmon and steelhead stocks (0%, 0% and 11% respectively), while the mid-Columbia has 40%, Puget Sound 56%, and the coast has 78% healthy wild salmon and steelhead stocks. Results are similar for native and total stocks. It is noteworthy that even the area with the healthiest stocks (the Washington Coast) still has wild stocks that are not healthy.

### **General Salmon Habitat Conditions in Washington State**

Habitat types and conditions also vary across the state. Washington ranks 20<sup>th</sup> in the nation in size and 15<sup>th</sup> in human population with  $\frac{3}{4}$  of the state's human population located in the Puget lowlands. Coniferous forest covers 37%, agriculture accounts for 21%, and urban lands comprise 2.5% of the state (Cassidy et al. 1997). There is much that we don't know about habitat conditions, and where we have information, the majority suggests degraded habitat. Most (43%) of the WRIA-scale habitat ratings are data gaps followed by poor habitat conditions (38%). Only 13% of the ratings are good and 7% are fair.

Only one WRIA (Upper Skagit) had overall good habitat ratings in all categories that were not data gaps. Methow, Naches, and Nisqually had an overall fair-good rating with 11 additional basins rating fair overall. Nine basins rated poor-fair, but more (21) basins rated poor than any other rating.

Data gaps are especially prevalent for water quality (particularly for water quality parameters other than temperature), sedimentation other than road density, and low flow categories. Data on pool habitat are even less common, but poor ratings in this category are often the result of impacts in landscape processes such as sedimentation, LWD supply, flow and riparian conditions, and measuring conditions of processes rather than symptoms (pools) is of greater value because it identifies the source(s) of the problem.

### **Land Ownership and Freshwater Habitat Conditions**

Habitat ratings in nine categories (access, floodplain, sedimentation, riparian, large woody debris (LWD), pool, water temperature, high flow and low flow) were related to land ownership, but most of the ratings were poor across all land ownership percentages and types with a low number of good or fair ratings. This coupled with a lack of parcel-specific information of habitat conditions and land use/land ownership resulted in an inability to produce correlations with p-values of .05 or less (statistically significant). However, some broad conclusions can be made.

Basins with higher percentages of federal land had generally better ratings for nearly all of the habitat categories including: access, floodplain, LWD, riparian, high flow, and sedimentation conditions. The remaining three categories (low flows, pools, and water temperature) were not associated with any specific extent of federal land ownership. Lower percentages of state-owned land had typically better ratings for access, floodplain, and LWD conditions. Habitat data in other categories were too scattered to suggest a relationship with various percentages of state-owned land. Lower percentages of private land ownership were generally associated with better ratings for floodplain, sedimentation, LWD, pool, and high flow conditions. Data in other categories were too scattered to suggest a relationship.

### **Land Use and Freshwater Habitat Conditions**

Forestry dominated WRIAs had generally better ratings for riparian, water temperature, and pool conditions, and nearly all of the fair to good rated WRIAs for access, floodplain, and LWD were in forestry dominated WRIAs. WRIAs with significant urban land use and/or higher human population densities had overall poor ratings in all but one habitat category. These poor rated categories include: access, floodplain, LWD, riparian, sedimentation, low flow, high flow, and pool conditions. The one category without a poor rating was water temperature, and this was due to widely scattered results. WRIAs dominated by agricultural lands had generally poor access, floodplain, and LWD conditions, while riparian and pool condition results were scattered across all percentages of agricultural land. Lower percentages of agricultural land were associated with better water temperature conditions.



## Conclusions

Habitat categories with the greatest percentage of poor ratings were floodplain, LWD, and riparian, while access (culverts), high flows (land cover), and water temperatures had the greatest percentage of good ratings. Data coverage was better for riparian conditions than any other category due to broad scale data from Lunetta et al. (1997). However, newer data are needed to continue to assess conditions in the future. Data collection programs exist for water quality data as well as for basic flow data in certain streams, but assessments are needed to monitor trends and relate flows to salmon use and production. At this time, there are no programs that are funded on a regular basis to monitor and assess access, floodplain, sedimentation, riparian, and instream habitat conditions.

When habitat conditions are related to land use, urbanized basins had generally worse habitat conditions in most categories. Basins dominated by forestry had the best habitat ratings compared to other land uses. WRIAs dominated by agriculture had ratings that were not as good as forestry-dominated basins, but generally not as bad as the overall ratings in more urbanized drainages.

It is important to recognize that these results are based upon the individual limiting factors reports, which are snapshots in time of habitat conditions. New data at the local level is constantly evolving and readers are encouraged to check with local salmon recovery planning organizations for the most up-to-date information. In addition, the summarization of data to a broad statewide level results in a necessary loss of variability and sense of data gaps or uncertainty within a basin. A review of information at the local level is important to retain that perspective.

# **HABITAT LIMITING FACTORS BACKGROUND AND INTRODUCTION**

## **How to Use This Document**

This report is made available in a portable document format (pdf). This allows anyone with a computer and free Adobe Acrobat Reader<sup>®</sup> software to read and print the document. Adobe Acrobat Reader is available at: <http://www.adobe.com/products/acrobat/readstep.html>. The Adobe software has several useful features to aid your use of this document. The zoom feature allows you to magnify details, which is particularly useful for maps. Blue underlined text appears throughout the document as hyperlinks that can take you directly to the referenced item. Also, the Acrobat software allows you to search for your topic of interest, and has bookmarks to quickly access a desired chapter.

## **Habitat Limiting Factors Background**

The successful recovery of naturally spawning salmon populations depends upon directing actions simultaneously at harvest, hatcheries, habitat and hydro; the four H's. The 1998 state legislative session produced a number of bills aimed at salmon recovery. Engrossed Substitute House Bill 2496 (now 77RCW) was a key piece of the 1998 Legislature's salmon recovery effort with the focus directed at salmon habitat issues.

Engrossed Substitute House Bill (ESHB) 77RCW in part:

- Directed the Conservation Commission in consultation with local government and the tribes to invite private, federal, state, tribal and local government personnel with appropriate expertise to act as a technical advisory group.
- Directed the technical advisory group to identify limiting factors for salmonids to respond to section 8 sub 2 of this act.
- Defined limiting factors as "conditions that limit the ability of habitat to fully sustain populations of salmon."
- Defined salmon as all members of the family Salmonidae, which are capable of self-sustaining, natural production.

The overall goal of the Conservation Commission's limiting factors project was to identify habitat factors limiting production of salmon in the state. In waters shared by salmon, steelhead trout and bull trout were also included. One area (WRIA 62, Pend Oreille) was included as bull trout only waters.

It is important to note that the responsibilities given to the Conservation Commission in 77RCW do not constitute a full limiting factors analysis. The hatchery, hydro and harvest segments of limiting factors are being dealt with in other forums.

## New Products in this Report

Several products are the result of this effort.

- Detailed Spreadsheet. In a separate file to this report, there is a large spreadsheet with ratings for all habitat categories by stream and stream reach (when available) that were in each of the Conservation Commission's Limiting Factors Analyses (LFA). This includes most salmon-producing streams in Washington State. It is provided as an Excel file instead of a PDF so that others can easily work with the data, and it puts all of the habitat ratings for salmon-producing streams in one place. The information in the spreadsheet is also the foundation for subsequent analyses in this report. In addition, it shows finer scale data to provide readers with a greater sense of variability and data gaps or uncertainty within a basin, which can be overlooked when examining coarser scale data. Readers are encouraged to keep these factors in mind and refer back to the spreadsheet to see the original results by stream.
- Salmonid Stock Status. Information summarizing salmonid stock status is also included and this information is presented by WRIA and by salmon recovery region. Such information includes the number of wild, native, and total stocks as well as the status of those stocks.
- Summary of LFA Ratings by WRIA. The individual LFA ratings were combined to form a WRIA-wide rating for each habitat parameter. This provides a snapshot of the extent of habitat degradations and data gaps by category across Washington State. It also illustrates the geographic range and locations of conditions and data gaps. This summary data were based directly on the detailed spreadsheet discussed above.
- Maps of Habitat Ratings by WRIA. Numerous maps are provided to quickly illustrate the extent of habitat conditions across the state for each habitat category. Categories include access, floodplain, sediment quantity, sediment quality, road density, stability, riparian, LWD, pools, water temperature, dissolved oxygen, other water quality issues (nutrients, pH, toxins), high flow conditions, impervious surfaces, and low flow conditions.
- Habitat Ratings and Land Ownership/Land Use. Lastly, this report includes a summary of the habitat ratings by WRIA and discusses how those ratings relate to land ownership and land use.